United Nations A/56/504–S/2001/1006

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
24 October 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session
Agenda item 62
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 22 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 22 October 2001, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Umit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-60019 (E) 291001

Annex to the letter dated 22 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot representative at the United Nations under agenda item 10, "Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization", on 25 September 2001 at the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Since the Greek Cypriot delegate, purporting to represent the so-called "Republic of Cyprus", has, once again, exploited this international forum, where the Turkish Cypriot side is denied its lawful representation, to make false accusations against the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey, I am compelled to respond to these accusations in writing.

In an attempt to brand the Turkish Cypriot side as the "intransigent" party in the process of talks, the Greek Cypriot representative, in his statement, distorts the position of the Turkish Cypriot side with regard to the talks and your efforts in the context of your good offices mission. As it will be recalled, in your statement of 14 November 1999, in which the commencement of the proximity talks was announced, it was stated that the aim of these talks was to "prepare the ground for meaningful negotiations leading to a comprehensive settlement." It will also be recalled that the Greek Cypriot side's rejection of your statement of 12 September 2000 (SG/SM/7546), made at the opening of the fourth round of proximity talks, eventually led to the breakdown of the proximity talks. In view of the fact that your opening statement basically reiterated a given framework that "the parties share a common desire to bring about, through negotiations in which each represents its side — and no one else — as the political equal of the other, a comprehensive settlement enshrining a new partnership", the Greek Cypriot rejection was alarming. This rejection confirmed the well-known Greek Cypriot position put forward clearly in the statement made by Mr. Glafcos Clerides, the leader of the Greek Cypriot administration, on 2 February 2000, during the second round of the proximity talks, that the aim of the Greek Cypriot side "is not to create a new state but an amendment of the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus". It should be recalled that following your opening statement, Mr. Clerides boycotted the proximity talks for days. Furthermore, the Greek Cypriot House of Representatives passed a resolution on 11 October 2000 stating that "the opening statement of the United Nations Secretary-General falls outside the letter and spirit of the framework of the talks" and "calls upon ... a full correction of the situation created by the United Nations Secretary-General's opening statement". This is clearly a rebuff of your mission of good offices.

Rejection of your statement dated 12 September 2000 meant that the Greek Cypriot side rejected even the most basic and given parameters for a settlement in Cyprus, namely, the establishment of a new partnership and the political equality of the two parties. While, on the one hand, the Greek Cypriot side pretends to negotiate for a just and lasting settlement, it rejects, on the other hand, the concept of a new partnership. This shows that the Greek Cypriot side is not sincere about a settlement based on partnership, which has been the aim of the United Nations-sponsored talks from the very beginning. The attempt by the Greek Cypriot representative to present the Turkish Cypriot side's stance on the preparation of the common ground prior to substantial negotiations as "preconditions", is in reality an attempt to conceal the

Greek Cypriot side's lack of support for the creation of a new partnership, hence a viable and just settlement.

Three decades of negotiations have demonstrated that no result can be achieved without first preparing the ground for meaningful and substantive negotiations leading to a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus. In the light of the Greek Cypriot party's rejection of a new partnership on the basis of equality, the insistence of the Turkish Cypriot party on the preparation of a common ground should not be seen as "intransigence" or as "withdrawal from the talks" but rather as an attempt to put the talks, which were derailed by the Greek Cypriot side's lack of goodwill, on the right track.

During your meeting with President Denktaş in Salzburg, Austria, on 28 August 2001, it was agreed that Mr. Alvaro de Soto, your Special Adviser on Cyprus, would travel to the island for consultations in order to find a common ground that would pave the way for talks between the two sides. During the meetings Mr. de Soto had with the Turkish Cypriot party, it became apparent that there existed no common ground. Despite the fact that the Turkish Cypriot party tried to impress upon Mr. de Soto that it was premature to invite the two sides for a meeting in New York, and knowing only too well that the Turkish Cypriot side could not attend the talks before the preparation of the ground, Mr. de Soto, at a press conference held on 5 September 2001 prior to his departure from the island, stated that he had extended your invitation to the two sides to resume the negotiations.

It is important to note that, both before and since the end of the process of proximity talks in November 2000, the Turkish Cypriot side has given its support to your good offices mission and has stated that it is ready to work towards establishing a common ground which would lead to substantive negotiations. However, as explained clearly by President Rauf R. Denktaş in his letter of 10 September 2001 addressed to you, since the invitation was to "resume the negotiations" and not to prepare the ground, the Turkish Cypriot party could not attend the talks scheduled to start on 12 September in New York. Concrete experience shows that any process started without the ground having been prepared is bound to fail, with dire consequences for prospects for reconciliation.

With regard to the accusation by the Greek Cypriot representative in his statement that Mr. Denktaş is "attempting to exploit and deliberately misinterpret the statement of the Secretary-General of 12 September of last year and calls for the creation of a 'new partnership'", I would like to invite the Greek Cypriot representative to read once again the statement of 12 September 2000, which refers, word for word, to the establishment of a "new partnership", and to recognize that the objective of the talks has always been and can only be the establishment of a new partnership. The Turkish Cypriot side did not feel the need to interpret a clear concept such as "new partnership", which can only mean that it will not be the continuation of the so-called "Republic of Cyprus".

The characterization by the Greek Cypriot representative of the confederation proposal of the Turkish Cypriot side as "unacceptable" shows that the Greek Cypriot side will not accept any settlement that would once and for all put an end to the Greek Cypriot aspiration of making Cyprus a Greek state with a Turkish Cypriot "minority". A settlement on the basis of the sovereign equality of the two parties will prevent the repetition of the 1963-1974 period, during which the Turkish Cypriot people were persecuted and oppressed while the Greek Cypriot side was

able to usurp the title of the partnership Republic of Cyprus by force of arms. The Turkish Cypriot side believes that if the Greek Cypriot administration's aspiration to Hellenize the island no longer exists, then the Greek Cypriot side would have no valid reason to reject a partnership.

With regard to the reference by the Greek Cypriot representative to the alleged "invasion" and "occupation" of the island, I would like to recall that the division of the island both territorially and ethnically came about in 1963 as a direct consequence of the Greek Cypriot onslaught on the Turkish Cypriot people. Hence, the creation of the *Green Line* by the British contingent on the island and the arrival of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus in 1964. It is also important to remember that the Turkish intervention, which was carried out in accordance with Turkey's rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, did not come about until 1974 and was the direct result of the coup d'ètat, carried out by the joint Greek-Greek Cypriot front, which aimed to annex the island to Greece and annihilate the Turkish Cypriot people. Contrary to the Greek Cypriot representative's claim, the only occupation in the island is the 38-year-long occupation of the seat of "government of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot administration. Furthermore, the Turkish military presence in Northern Cyprus, in accordance with the 1960 international treaties and with the consent of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, is a security requirement for the Turkish Cypriot people against the repetition of Greek Cypriot aggression, particularly in view of the continuing Greek-Greek Cypriot Joint Military Dogma.

The Greek Cypriot representative has paid lip service to "tolerance and multiculturalism" and has tried to accuse the Turkish Cypriot side of presenting "differences in religion and ethnicity, as the raison d'être of creating two different states in Cyprus". It is, in fact, the Greek Cypriot mentality, which is shaped by intolerance towards the existence in Cyprus of anything that is of Turkish origin, that makes a settlement on the basis of two states a vital necessity for the Turkish Cypriot side. This intolerance, which took the form of a genocide against the Turkish Cypriot people, as detailed in the Akritas Plan, put into effect in 1963, and the continued imposition of embargoes on the Turkish Cypriot people in all spheres of life by the Greek Cypriot administration, is the raison d'être for a confederation formula in Cyprus. Furthermore, contrary to the Greek Cypriot allegation that these "realities" would create a very dangerous precedent in international affairs, I would like to state that it is the denial of these realities that has sustained the Cyprus question and created an unjust situation in the island.

With regard to the decision of the European Court of Human Rights, both in the case of *Loizidou* and the fourth "state application" by the Greek Cypriot administration, I would like to reiterate our position, which was extensively expounded in President Rauf R. Denktaş's letter of 31 May 2001 (A/55/986-S/2001/575) and mine of 27 August 2001 (A/55/1030-S/2001/824) both addressed to you. The Court has based its decisions on political considerations, wrongfully excluding the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus from the proceedings, and considering Turkey, which has no jurisdiction in Northern Cyprus, as the party to the proceedings. The wrong premise naturally led to the wrong conclusions. As regards the Greek Cypriot representative's reference in his statement to the "subordinate local administration", suffice to say that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, established by the Turkish Cypriot people through the exercise of their inherent right to self-determination, is a sovereign and independent State.

Mr. Sotos Zackheos, as representative of the Greek Cypriot administration, an illegal and illegitimate administration that usurped, by force of arms, the title of the "government of Cyprus" and ordered massacres of the Turkish Cypriot people and continues to this day to impose inhuman embargoes on them, has tried to distort the human rights record of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. I would like to remind the Greek Cypriot representative that as documented in the United States State Department's country report on human rights practices in Cyprus, published in February 2000, it is confirmed that human rights are well respected in Northern Cyprus. While also distorting the facts pertaining to the economic and social standards in Northern Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot representative fails to mention the unjustified embargoes ranging from trade and tourism to travel and sports imposed on the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot administration, which has significantly curtailed the development efforts of the Turkish Cypriots since 1963.

It is the Turkish Cypriot side that is interested in finding a just and lasting settlement recognizing the legitimate rights of the Turkish Cypriot people, namely their political equality and sovereignty. The day the Greek Cypriot administration recognizes to the sovereign equality of the Turkish Cypriot side, the Cyprus question will be settled easily.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the support of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus for your mission of good offices and to reiterate that the Turkish Cypriot party is ready to engage in a new effort to prepare the ground for meaningful talks, provided that the Greek Cypriot side also shares the same vision of partnership and principles for the future of the island.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 62, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Aytuğ **Plümer**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus